DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 898 JC 770 517

AUTHOR Garlock, Jerry C.
TITLE Flexible Calendar and Staff Development.
INSTITUTION El Camino Coll., Torrance, Calif.
REPORT NO OIR-77-15
PUB DATE 1 Nov 77
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Problems; Administrator Attitudes; Community Colleges; Enrichment Activities; *Faculty Development; *Junior Colleges; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *School Calendars; *Semester Division; Staff Improvement; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

Three questionnaires were used at El Camino College to assess a flexible calendar that allowed ten days between semesters for staff development activities. A locally developed questionnaire on staff development drew responses from 245 instructors (68.6%), a state questionnaire on the flexible calendar was answered by 57% of full-time and 17% of part-time faculty, and an administrator's version received 21 responses. From 30 staff development events, a book fair and two faculty symposiums drew the highest participation. Events with highest interest and personal value included a physical fitness seminar, a coronary pulmonary resuscitation seminar, a learning skills for social sciences workshop, and a readers' theatre. The flexible calendar faculty survey responses indicated that 70% did not drastically revise course content during the shortened 16-week semester provided by the new calendar, and 66% did not feel student achievement was reduced. The elimination of post-Christmas semester continuation was seen as a positive feature by 85%, and 65% did not wish to return to a traditional semester. Individual comments and response distributions by program areas to the questionnaires are appended. (RT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145898

FLEXIBLE CALENDAR AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1976-1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jerry C. Garlock

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EL CAMINO COLLEGE

OIR 77-15

November 1, 1977

JC 770 517

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

JERRY C. GARLOCK, Ph.D.

FLEXIBLE CALENDAR AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1976-1977

El Camino College is one of the six California community colleges participating in the flexible calendar experimental program. In the school year 1976-1977, an early fall semester was completed before Christmas and the ten days at the end of January which preceded the spring semester was used for staff development. During the first year in operation, the staff development program had a duration of two weeks and involved the participation of all full-time faculty members.

Meetings in the fall (1976) were centered around planning the two-week schedule of activities and developing the philosophy that each faculty member would be able to choose activities worthwhile to him and that no pressure would be exerted by the administration.

A low-keyed approach was adopted towards fitting a massive program to the needs of 370 different individuals. A nesting system was used to allow individuals to select activities. Schoolwide events, such as academic senate meetings, were planned. Divisions and departments planned activities within this framework. Finally, individuals chose activities from this potpourri and/or filled in with their own projects, such as preparing instructional materials or participating in curricular conferences. The staff development period occurred while students were registering for classes.

A schoolwide Staff Development Committee consisted of all division deans and faculty representatives from each division. The committee was chaired by the Vice President of Instruction who was responsible for the staff development program. From this committee evolved the basic philosophy of El Camino's staff development program in the context of the people it would affect and the state program of which it was a part. A Staff Development Steering Committee consisted of three faculty members, three division deans, and the Vice President of Instruction. This subcommittee of volunteers was responsible for coordinating the mechanics of the schoolwide program.

Division Staff Development Committees were formed to plan activities which would benefit the faculty of each division. These committees also reviewed the individual plans of faculty members. While no punitve measures of any kind were taken, this review function constituted the only accountability check for the program. Trust in professional ethics justified this method in preference to timeclock methods.

Each division was responsible for evaluating the activities of its faculty. A division report was written based on written individual accounts, Division Staff Development Committee evaluations, and possibly division meetings. The reports were summarized by division deans at a meeting of the Staff Development Committee in the spring of 1977. A report was also requested of the Institutional Research Office summarizing data gathered from a questionnaire evaluating the group activities and distributed to all faculty members.

Two assessment approaches were used to assess the staff development activities for the year 1976-1977. The first was a locally developed staff

questionnaire that was designed to assess essentially the staff development activities in January of 1976. The second consisted of a questionnaire designed by the State Flexible Calendar Committee under the auspices of the Chancellor's Office. This committee designed three questionnaires--one for administrators, one for faculty, and one for students. The administrator and faculty questionnaires were used with little or no change from the sample questionnaires provided by the Chancellor's Office. The student questionnaire was not administered because it was felt that there was insufficient time to select those students who were enrolled in the fall of 1976 and who also had some previous experience of a nonabbreviated semester.

The results of the local questionnaire on staff development are shown in Table 1. During the fall of 1976, El Camino College had 357 instructors. During the staff development period, many instructors worked on individual projects. Others worked in small groups. Others participated in staff development activities that were meetings, seminars, and workshops. Some instructors participated in combinations of these. Of those attending college-wide meetings, seminars or workshops, questionnaires were provided for them to assess the events in which 245 instructors responded. This represented 68.6 per cent of the staff of the college. The results of the questionnaire are shown in Table 1. The greatest number of responses to any event was 97 (39.6 per cent) at the Book Fair. The Faculty Symposium "The New Student," and the Faculty Symposium "Grading and Academic Standards" also showed high participation. The events that showed the highest per cent of high interest or value was the Physical Fitness Seminar in which 64.1 per cent indicated that this event had highest interest or value. This was followed by Coronary Pulmonary Resuscitation Seminar, Learning Skills for Social Sciences/Behavioral Sciences, and the Readers Theatre. Other activities such as the Open House of the Placement Office showed little participation and not a high degree of interest or value.

Table 2 shows the number of responses to the staff development questionnaire which were "write'in" responses and are presented as a supplement to Table 1. Those responding to the questionnaire had an opportunity to complete an unstructured portion of the questionnaire. The comments were categorized into seven classifications: (1) strongly positive comments, (2) positive comments, (3) negative comments, (4) strongly negative comments, (5) comments on other than listed workshops, (6) general comments, and (7) recommendations. There are about as many positive comments as negative comments. In general, they were reflective of individualized perceptions. In general, instructors who participated in other than campus-wide structured activities were satisfied and felt that their individual activities were successful. The comments made by the staff members on the staff development questionnaire are presented in the Appendix. The results of the staff development questionnaire were valuable to members of the Staff Development Committee of the college, and they will be used to improve the program for staff development activities in 1978.

Three hundred faculty members (57 per cent of the full-time and 17 per cent of the part-time) responded to the questionnaire. The results o. the questionnaire are indicated in Table 3. The results indicated that 70 per cent of the instructors did not drastically revise their course content and that they were able to cover the necessary course content adequately during the 16-week semester. Two-thirds of the instructors did not feel that student

Table 1

PER CENT OF RESPONSES TO THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

EVENTS	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	LITTLE OR NO INTEREST OR VALUE 1	2	3	4	HIGHEST INTEREST OR VALUE 5
Academic Senate Meeting	56	5.4	17.9	44.6	19.6	12.5
Coronary Pulmonary Resuscitation Seminar	36	2.8	0.0	11.1	27.8	58.3
Physical Fitness Seminar	39	5.1	5.1	5.1	20.5	64.1
Slide Presentation "Cloning in Plant Tissues Cultures"	21	4.8	4.8	9.5	38.1	42.8
Open Houses						
Anthropology Museum	31	19.4	0.0	12.9	35.5	32.2
Art Gallery	37	13.5	5.4	35.2	27.0	18.9
Campus Theatre & Auditorium	7	14.3	14.3	14.3	28.6	28.6
Placement Office	9	33.3	0.0	33.3	22.2	11.1
Photography Laboratory	10	10.0	0.0	10.0	40.0	40.0
ERIC-Library Workshop	29	10.4	3.4	10.4	37.9	37.9
Faculty Symposium "The New Student"	84	17.9	20.2	33.3	19.1	9.5
Grammar of Design Seminar	13	7.7	23.1	38.4	15.4	15.4
Workshop "Teacher Personality/Teacher Style"	35	14.3	2.9	25.7	17.1	40.0
Audio-Visual Equipment Seminar	32	9.4	6.3	31.2	34.4	18.7
Book Fair	97	9.3	13.4	37.1	29.9	10.3
Pre-Retirement Seminar	40	17.5	25.0	15.0	25.0	17.5
Readers Theatre	11	9.1	0.0	27.3	9.1	54.5
Audio-Visual Materials Seminar	26	7.7	11.5	23.1	26.9	30.8
Learning Skills for Social Sciences/Behavioral Sciences	14	14.3	7.2	0.0	21.4	57.1
Acupuncture, Kinesiology, Muscle and Joint Injury Seminar	21	4.8	4.8	9.5	33.3	47.6
Seminar "Governance in the Community College"	65	15.4	10.8	23.1	26.1	24.6
Slide Presentation "Kyoto-The Magic City of Gardens and Temples"	21	4.8	14.3	14.3	38.1	28.5
District Bus Tour	33	9.1	3.0	3.0	39.4	45.5
Film "Cipher in the Snow"	20	10.0	15.0	25.0	10.0	40.0
Lecture-Discussion "Human Genetics"	10	10.0	0.0	10.0	40.0	40.0
Faculty Symposium "Grading and Academic Standards"	89	10.1	12.4	29.2	28.1	20.2
Slide Presentation "The Magic Land of Bali and Indonesia"	12	8.3	16.7	16.7	25.0	33.3
Faculty Slide-A-Thon	4	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
Speaker: CSUCS, "New Mandated Testing and Writing Program"	32	18.8	15.6	34.4	15.6	15.6
Demonstration and Theory of Biofeedback	26	7.7	11.5	11.5	26.9	42.3

Table 2

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TO THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRES WHICH WERE "WRITE-IN" RESPONSES

EVENT	LITTLE OR NO INTEREST OR VALUE 1	2	3	4	HIGHEST INTEREST OR VALUE 5
CCE Seminar		1	1		1
Disabled Student Workshop					2
Learning Center					1
Library				1	
"Hurry Tomorrow" Film	1		1		3
Computer Science Meeting/Seminar					2
Yoga					1
Security					1
Switchboard					1
Steve Montgomery's discussion on his use of the tutorial method rate					1
Media Users Day at the Anaheim Convention Center		1			
Ethnic Studies Discussion				1	
Open Forum on Faculty Evaluation			1		
Individualized Instruction	1				

Table 3

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF RESPONSES OF THE FLEXIBLE CALENDAR - FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

N=300

TOTAL FACULTY

In the following areas please respond according to your degree of agreement to each statement.	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. Shortened Instructional Year					
It was necessary to drastically revise the content for my courses due to the change from an 18 week to a 16 week semester.	4.3 (13)	13.0 (39)	8.3 (25)	47.3 (142)	23.3 (70)
I was able to cover the necessary course content adequately in the 16 week semester.	18.3 (55)	52.0 (156)	3.7 (11)	16.0 (48)	7.0 (21)
Due to the 16 week semester student achievement in my course(s) was reduced significantly compared to past student performance.	4.3 (13)	11.0 (33)	14.3 (43)	44.3 (133)	22.0 (66)
The 16 week semester did not detract from the quality of my instruction.	27.7 (83)	42.0 (126)	6.0 (18)	15.0 (45)	5.3 (16)
The 16 week semester increased student persistence in my course(s).	7.3 (22)	15.3 (46)	42.3 (127)	19.7 (59)	9.3 (28)
B. Early Semester Calendar					
Eliminating the need to continue the Fall semester after the Christmas vacation is a positive feature of the early semester calendar.	61.7 (185)	23.0 (69)	2.0 (6)	3.3 (10)	8.7 (26)
The early semester calendar interfered with my summer vacation.	22.7 (68)	18.3 (55)	13.0 (39)	27.3 (82)	17.0 (51)
The early start calendar caused students to register late for the Fall term and they were unable to "catch up" with course material.	6.0 (18)	9.7 (29)	24.7 (74)	42.0 (126)	15.3 (46)
I would like to see our college return to the traditional semester calendar.	18.0 (54)	5.3 (16)	9.7 (29)	27.3 (82)	37.3 (112)
C. Non-Instructional Days					
The use of 10 "Non-instructional days" in the current college calendar:					
(a) Provided time for staff development opportunities not available to faculty in prior years	23.7 (71)	38.0 (114)	18.3 (55)	8.7 (26)	9.3 (28)
(b) Improved college communication					
(1) among faculty within my Division	13.3 (40)	33.3 (100)	21.3 (64)	16.7 (50)	11.3 (34)
(2) between faculty and administration	5.3 (16)	17.3 (52)	35.0 (105)	23.3 (70)	13.7 (41)
(3) among faculty in different Division	6.7 (20)	26.0 (78)	32.0 (96)	19.0 (57)	11.0 (33)

C. Non-Instructional Days (continued)	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(b) Improved college communication					
(4) between full-time and part-time faculty	6.7 (20)	17.3 (52)	28.3 (85)	24.3 (73)	17.3 (52)
(5) between faculty and support staff	4.0 (12)	21.0 (63)	33.7 (101)	21.3 (64)	13.7 (41)
(c) Provided collegewide activities of benefit to me	9.3 (28)	38.7 (116)	18.0 (54)	16.0 (48)	13.0 (39)
(d) Provided Division-wide activities of benefit to me	12.3 (37)	33.7 (101)	19.7 (59)	17.7 (53)	12.0 (36)
(e) Provided individual project activities of benefit to me.	28.0 (84)	30.3 (91)	18.0 (54)	8.7 (26)	10.3 (31)
There was adequate faculty planning in the development of					
(a) the college academic calendar	7.0 (21)	31.3 (94)	34.7 (104)	15.0 (45)	8.0 (24)
(b) activities during the non-instructional days.	8.7 (26)	40.7 (122)	27.3 (82)	11.3 (34)	6.7 (20)
There was sufficient information supplied to faculty concerning activities possible during the non-instructional days.	9.3 (28)	44.3 (133)	17.0 (51)	17.7 (53)	7.7 (23)

The 10 non-instructional days were most beneficial for me in the areas of: (check no more than three)

17.7 (53) (a) major redesign of course(s)
18.0 (54) (b) new course/program development
41.0 (123) (c) updating of course content
35.3 (106) (d) developing new instructional materials for use in classroom
1.6 (5) (e) developing new instructional materials for use in Learning Resource Center
4.3 (13) (f) developing new instructional materials for use in course/program evaluation
16.0 (48) (g) exploring alternative instructional methods
12.3 (37) (h) field visits to other college programs
15.0 (45) (i) field visits to sites related to my program area
13.3 (40) (j) college meetings, conferences
14.0 (42) (k) division meetings or conferences
13.3 (40) (l) inservice training workshops at the college
4.7 (14) (m) professional conferences on workshops
3.0 (9) (n) student advising
17.7 (53) (o) subject area research
.7 (2) (p) institutional research

5.3 (16) (q) review of library holdings

2.0 (6) (r) assessment of community needs and preferences

1.0 (3) (s) develop short-term courses

4.0 (12) (t) relief for classroom.

The 10 days devoted to "non-instructional activities" during the current academic year are: (check one)

1.3 (4) (a) not enough

31.0 (93) (b) too much

47.0 (141) (c) just about right.

The most productive time for scheduling the non-instructional days is: (check one)

11.0 (33) (a) immediately prior to the Fall presemester

56.3 (169) (b) in January, between the two semesters

2.3 (7) (c) at the end of the academic year

6.3 (19) (d) during the Fall or Spring semester

1.0 (3) (e) during Summer.

achievement in their course was reduced significantly. Seventy per cent indicated that the 16-week semester did not detract from the quality of their instruction. Twenty-three per cent indicated that the 16-week semester increased student persistence in their course while 29 per cent indicated that it decreased their persistence. Eighty-five per cent indicated that eliminating the need to continue the fall semester after Christmas vacation was a positive feature of the early semester calendar. Over 40 per cent maintain that the early semester calendar interfered with their summer vacation while approximately 44 per cent indicated that it did not. Fifty-seven per cent did not agree with the statement that the early start calendar caused students to register late for the fall term and that they were unable to catch up with course material. Approximately 23 per cent maintain that they would like to see the college return to the traditional semester while approximately 65 per cent maintain that they disagreed with such a return. There was divided reaction in the amount of improvement of communications among various groups on campus. However, there was an indication that the use of the 10 "non-instructional days" in the current college calendar provided time for staff development opportunities not available to faculty in prior years; provided college-wide activities to benefit the instructor; provided division-wide activities to benefit the instructor; and provided individual project activities to benefit the instructor period.

The areas that were most beneficial to instructors during the 10 "non-instructional days" were updating course content (41 per cent) and developing new instructional materials for use in classroom (35 per cent). Almost half of the respondees indicated that the 10 days devoted to "non-instructional activities" maintain that the time was just about right while almost a third indicated that it was too much time.

Of those responding, most of the instructors maintain that the most productive time for scheduling the "non-instructional days" is in January between the two semesters.

The results of the administrator questionnaire are shown in Table 4. The results indicate that there is general agreement in the following areas: (1) Eliminating the need to continue the fall semester after the Christmas vacation is a positive feature of the early start calendar; (2) the use of 10 "non-instructional days" provided time for staff development opportunities not available to faculty in previous years, (3) there was sufficient information supplied to faculty concerning activities possible during the "non-instructional days," and (4) it is important that non-instructional activities include part-time faculty and that the flexible calendar pilot program did not present formidable administrative problems to the administrator.

Other items of the administrative questionnaire did not give definitive results. The most pronounced of these was the statement, "The early start calendar date for instruction during the fall term is a serious problem," in which 11 agreed and 10 disagreed. To this item, not one administrator had "no opinion."

Table 4

THE FLEXIBLE CALENDAR - ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

In the following areas please respond according to your degree of agreement to each statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. Early Semester Calendar					
(1) The early semester calendar has facilitated student articulation from high school to college.	1	3	6	8	3
(2) The early semester calendar has facilitated student articulation to four year institutions.	2	9	6	4	
(3) Eliminating the need to continue the Fall semester after the Christmas vacation is a positive feature of the early start calendar.	18	3		1	
(4) The early starting date for instruction during the Fall term is a serious problem.	3	8		5	5
B. Non-Instructional Days					
(1) The use of 10 "non-instructional days" in the current college calendar:					
(a) Provided time for staff development opportunities not available to faculty in prior years.	9	10	1		1
(b) Improved college communication between faculty and administration.	5	5	6	3	2
(c) Improved college communication between faculty and support staff.	4	5	7	3	2
(2) There was adequate faculty planning in the development of:					
(a) the college academic calendar	4	9	3	4	
(b) activities during the non-instructional days	10	5	1	2	2
(3) There was sufficient information supplied to faculty concerning activities possible during the non-instructional days.	8	9		4	
(4) The non-instructional period was utilized effectively by faculty with beneficial results.	3	11	1	5	1
(5) The non-instructional period poses a serious problem of faculty accountability.	3	3	3	9	3

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
B. Non-Instructional Days (continued)					
(6) It is important that non-instructional activities include: (a) part-time faculty	6	11	2	2	
(b) administrators	7	9	2	1	2
(c) support staff.	5	9	4	1	1
C. Pilot Program					
(1) The flexible calendar pilot program has presented formidable administrative problems for me.		3	1	12	5
(2) The flexible calendar option should be extended to all California Community Colleges.	5	9	3	1	3

The 10 days devoted to "non-instructional activities" during the current academic year are: (check one)

____ (a) not enough

9 (b) too many

11 (c) just about right.

What are the most significant benefits of the flexible calendar pilot program?

What are the most significant disadvantages of the flexible calendar pilot program?

What are your suggestions for improving the pilot program?

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON THE ADMINISTRATOR
FLEXIBLE CALENDAR QUESTIONNAIRE

The evaluation questionnaire which was distributed to administrators contained three open-ended questions relating to the advantages of the pilot program, disadvantages, and suggestions for improvement. The collection of responses below are quoted from the questionnaires. No attempt has been made to evaluate the responses. The responses represent individual attitudes rather than a general consensus.

Responses are categorized by their applicability to different phases of the experimental program: the early calendar, the short semester, and staff development.

I What are the most significant benefits of the flexible calendar pilot program?

A. Early Calendar and Short Semester

1. Elimination of the lame duck session after Christmas.
2. Opportunity to complete the fall semester prior to the Christmas holidays.
3. Eliminates Christmas interference with instruction.
4. Provides vacation time during a period other than the summer.
5. Improves spring registration.
6. Student articulation to four-year institutions.
7. Registration at a time when classes are not being held.
8. Provides opportunity for catching up on accumulated work.

B. Staff Development

1. Provides meeting time and preparation time.
2. Opportunity for department activities requiring extended periods of time.
3. Opportunity for special research by faculty.
4. It gives faculty time to prepare materials for their courses and do some visiting they might not otherwise do.
5. Provides for faculty growth.
6. The faculty and administration have the time necessary to tackle major projects--such as curriculum development, updating courses, etc.
7. Allows for more interdisciplinary communication.
8. Opportunity to develop instructional materials and have important learning experiences, e.g. visiting industry or other colleges.
9. Interaction between levels of responsibility on campus.

II What are the most significant disadvantages of the flexible calendar pilot program?

A. Early Calendar

1. Probably that the starting dates and ending dates for each semester do not coincide with the local high schools, elementary schools, etc.
2. Starting in August for mothers of school age children.
3. Starts before summer vacations are over.
4. Because we are so far out of phase with other schools, the ADA at El Camino has dropped.
5. Unequal days in semesters.
6. Articulation midyear high school.

B. Short Semester

1. It takes away valuable instruction time from students.
2. Need for as many days of instruction as possible.

C. Staff Development

1. The schedule does not allow for events that may not occur during the specific 10 days to count toward staff development. Many important events happen in the Los Angeles area that would interest faculty in satisfying the requirements of the Staff Development program.
2. Faculty generally does not take it seriously.

D. Total Schedule

1. Too much time for faculty and students between semesters.
2. Graduation in June makes the summer too short to schedule all vacations.
3. Facilities of the college go mostly unused during January.
4. Early start -- August is early.
5. In order to articulate with the high schools, we must start the spring semester and summer session later than would be necessary thus reducing summer vacation time.

III What are your suggestions for improving the pilot program?

A. Early Calendar

1. If this could be extended to elementary and high schools as well as colleges, it would work fine. Everyone would be aware and accept the fact that school starts in mid-August rather than mid-September as it has for so long.

B. Staff Development Activities

1. More carefully planned and appropriate meetings relative to the instructional program.
2. Department Chairmen and Deans should be held accountable for the efficiency and effective involvement of their peers and staff.

C. Scheduling Staff Development

1. Open the second semester in mid-January. Lengthen the staff development period prior to the fall semester. Lengthen the time between the close of summer school and the opening of the fall semester.
2. Schedule 5 days in one block. Allow each individual any other 5 days during the school year to do approved projects or attend approved events.
3. Have 5 days of staff development at the beginning of the fall semester and 5 days between semesters. Make it mandatory that all full time faculty put in so many hours on campus.
4. Better use of non-instructional days -- scattered throughout the school year.
5. If there is any merit in the program, the time could be required beyond the 175 teaching days.
6. Either eliminate it or cut it at least by one-half.
7. Consider abandoning it.

D. Miscellaneous

1. It would help if the minicourses were advertised more and the stop and start dates were coordinated better. In other words, offer enough kinds of classes to attract the good student who could take advantage of short courses.
2. Stay on the "short" semester but begin after LAbor Day -- having a holiday break -- and concluding in January. This would still allow a break between semesters for registration, staff development, etc.

From the results of the data obtained from the questionnaires, decisions can be made from the Staff Development Committee, the Flexible Calendar Committee, and the administration to identify goals and develop policies and activities.

The faculty questionnaire was also analyzed by division to determine divisional differences. The results are shown in Appendix B. All data in Appendix B are presented as per cents. Each of the 11 divisions have obvious abbreviations. The last two categories are "Counseling" and "No Designation."

Some items represent a high degree of consistency (for example, "the early semester calendar interfered with my summer vacation" and "the 10 non-instructional days were most beneficial for me in the areas of updating course content") while others showed much more variability among divisions ("I would like to see our college return to the traditional semester calendar" and "The use of 10 'non-instructional days' in the current college calendar improved college communications among faculty within my division."). A more thorough analysis can be made from a more detailed investigation of Appendix B.

APPENDIX A

COMMENTS MADE BY
STAFF MEMBERS ON THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Strongly Positive Comments

The staff development program was excellent. Next year it should be even better.

The staff development seminars were extremely interesting and beneficial to me. I felt the exchange of ideas between the divisions fostered an esprit de corps between the faculty that was the highlight of the two week program.

I attended Sketching Class which was excellent.

I have a highly favorable attitude towards the staff development period. This attitude is especially based on the flexibility of determining one's own program for professional growth. I would like to see the continued use of a scheduled program of events with the option of determining one's own activities.

The trip to Golden West Community College was very worth while. I wish the class or meeting on "Use of the Computer" had been repeated. The one session given conflicted with another meeting.

Also attended meeting at Learning Center (5) Open Forum on Faculty Evaluation cancelled. I found the programs planned within the B E Division to be the most valuable. The Placement Office open house rated a "0" since there was none when I went over. The bus tour was excellent. The articulation with part-time instructors in the B E Division was very worthwhile.

Of maximum value was the time the staff spent in discussion of articulation between sequential courses, grading practices, teaching methods, testing standards, etc. The visit to the chem dept of Dominguez State (Cal State Dominguez) was of interest also.

Positive Comments

I believe that in general the Staff Development program was successful and worthwhile.

I found these two weeks to be a profitable and in some cases an enjoyable experience. With all the interesting meetings scheduled, however, I scarcely found any time to work in my office.

I believe the total project (Staff development) was potentially a very good one. I noticed that several sessions were poorly attended (one had only 2 participants) but with experience, and advance planning, and more stimulus for part of the faculty to engage in the program this could, and should, be the most effective method of faculty wide personal development. I hope it can be even better next year.

Worthwhile project.

Our own Departmental Functions were of more value.

The Cooperative Career Seminar and the one for the handicapped were not listed, both were good.

I have put checks beside the meetings I would have considered most valuable if I were continuing teaching. Since I am retiring, I spent most of my time revising my 1A course for the last semester.

Negative Comments

Glucksman's seminar was very good, Maier's quite bad. Overall: disappointing, poorly planned, poorly organized--hopefully we've learned for next time. Film on "Battered Child"--amateurish, dated, poorly made film. ..."Hurry Tomorrow," awful, " ", current, but very poorly made (editing, direction, etc.) accompanied by a couple of ill-prepared polemicists who did more harm for a good cause than they imagined.

I feel that most of the activities offered were frivolous and/or unstructured. I do not object to a staff development period, but rather to the way in which it was handled this time.

"...I evermore came out By the same door wherein I went."

Steve Montgomery's discussion of his use of the Tutorial Method rate (5)
With few exceptions, the level of the seminars seemed to be as poor as it could be; poorly planned, intellectually insulting. The time could have been used in such a way as to contribute importantly to the implementation of staff projects. The "seminars" could have been held in cafeteria rooms. This would have provided a workshop atmosphere. Let us hope that the next staff development program is planned more intelligently.

The values were sporadic or momentary, so an over-all evaluation is difficult. Most seminars were poorly conducted, so that potential values were seldom realized.

I would have preferred having this time for my classes.

I felt that the work done in the department, and requiring the presence of all faculty in the department, was worthwhile. However, it will not need to be done again next year. The discussion meetings were, for the greater part, a waste of time, although I thought that the meeting on Academic Standards was worth while in showing a concensus of faculty opinion on the inadequate performance of students who come into classes without basic skills. However, since there seemed to be no representatives of the adminstration present, it seems doubtful that any of the results of this meeting will ever cause further action. The governance meeting seemed to me disorganized and pointless and far off the topic, as so many of those panel-type discussions tend to be. I think that 3 days of this sort of thing would be more than enough. The other 7 should have been spent teaching, so that the students would not be deprived of material that ought to be covered.

Terribly disappointing that "Hurry Tomorrow" was so poorly attended and somehow even missed being placed on this response form!!!

Strongly Negative Comments

I would real rather not fill out this form. On a campus where the faculty morale is not quite "adequate," I found the one function of and result of staff "development" to be a further lowering of the morale. I found most of these "activities" typical laughable time-killing and frankly resent their intrusion on my own professional activities. The phrase, "staff development" more than implies a growth of the staff--not still-born fetuses or the planting of plastic flowers in unfertilized soil. My attitude is not, I have discovered, a minority attitude.

Although I rated some of these activities "high," it was mainly because they were interesting to me. To be honest there was no activity I attended that will improve my instruction. I feel the two week staff development was a waste of time and money. The problems we discussed at the seminars (grade inflation, illiteracy, etc.) were already known by the staff. No solutions to any of these problems were found. I personally would like the time given back to the students. These 10 days have really hurt Math I students.

Do not allow student time to be used for this RUBBISH. Each of these could be given at an 11 o'clock "free" hour (Tu./Th.) or after regular classes at a prescribed time. Students are coming from ghettos who must be tutored in kindergarten subject (a) listening 1st (b) getting to class and (c) not destroying the room! 1st and 2nd, case in sound of letters short a long a! (a) TEST THEM (b) PLACE THEM. Use this time to test them (most G.I.'s and most blacks and browns) Allow $$$ for the 6th grade average reading level people to take Elem: Sch: completion!!!

Comments on Other Than Listed Workshops

Most of my time was spent on: (1) Revision of Chem 1B supplement (2) Revision of Chem 1B Mid-term tests (3) Trying to coordinate Chem 4-1A-1B. First 2 were achieved; the 3rd one was about 20% achieved so that we are not much further along than we were 20 years ago. Too many people without an authoritative leader get no place!

Visited industry for new ideas and job opportunities--resulting in jobs for 5 students. Reworked much that needed doing but not time to do so. Hope the program continues.

Most of the time was occupied with setting up Field Training (Soc 11) and VOICE Programs plus scheduling speakers and calendar for Spring semester. Attended divisional meeting and previewed film for possible use.

The events which I attended were sponsored essentially by the P. E. Dept. They were excellent.

Most of the time was spent in department meetings which were very beneficial and interesting.

Made a personal tour of campus--(1) rode an hour with security patrol-(2) watched switchboard operators and had them explain the system. Had several meetings to up-date curricula.

Excellent opportunity to tie up loose ends. Presentations were well done. No pressure and flexibility helped make the period worthwhile. Surprised more divisions didn't participate.

My visitations to local Community Colleges was very informative.

Worked in industry for the full two weeks (off campus). The experience was of great value.

I visited the Southwest Museum, the Getty Museum, the Northrup Institute Aeronautical Library, the Lummis Home and the Citizens Bank Sports Hall of Fame and Library. I recommed all of these except Lummis Home. I think we may be able to add events on campus to improve the sessions next year.

Dept. and Div. meetings were very helpful.

I had much success and satisfaction working on my own classes. I am very interested in academic standards, but the presentation left much to be desired. The Book Fair is valuable, but didn't fit my needs at this time.

I felt that working with other department members on department projects was a more important use of the time. I also feel that one such week would be sufficient--if any at all, and more importantly, feel that the time could be better spent in instruction.

Data Processing x (3). My activities included visiting other college computer centers. It was a valuable experience.

I did part of my S.D. working in a private studio. Of the several campus activities I attended I was interested most in the C.P.R. Seminar. This was not only from the standpoint of content, but also because it made me realize how many fields of knowledge and the experts to communicate it we have available here. I would enjoy visiting other departments and having some phases of their programs presented (in terms a layman would understand).

Of greatest import to me was my individual project.

Attended special departmental meetings and a lecture delivered in the foreign language department by Dr. Klausing of USC regarding Teaching Techniques. The whole concept of professional growth is excellent. Those 2 weeks were of enormous benefit to me in providing time to prepare for spring semester classes, to examine books, to organize materials, etc. Departmental meetings should form a larger segment of the general activity, however. We need to exchange views.

The most valuable portion of the entire staff development period was the time devoted to preparation of courses, textbook selection, and general getting of one's office in working order. Departmental meetings were valuable, as were discussions with one's colleagues on course content and methodology--These latter were informal, unscheduled activities. The school-wide meetings were (as always) frustrating because of one's conviction that the talking would

lead nowhere. There was a lot of shop-talk; but one feels that changes occur without much regard to the wishes of the faculty (or perhaps because there's no real consensus). The social aspect (seeing one's old friends again) was nice.

In addition to those listed, there were division activities which were exceedingly valuable.

Attended Audio-Visual Conference in Anaheim with Reading instructors--all day session--interesting--too expensive. Attended several others--apparently not listed.

Although I attended a minimum of the scheduled events, I was able to revise courses and tests, work on new courses, examine textbooks, and engage in numerous small tasks associated with my teaching. To me, these were more valuable than most of the events seemed to be.

General Comments

It could be interesting research to count how many claimed they attended each event. Sixty was a high attendance at the mass group meetings; some only 30-40; most 20 or less. It seemed large numbers felt they didn't need to attend the seminars. That's OK if they clearly accomplished an alternate "accountable self-development program." I want to thank the sincere efforts of most of the program planners and participants. More attention needs to be paid to what is really essential to avoid lack of depth in evaluating the prime issues more critically. It seemed many teachers decided to take a cynical view even before the sessions, and then to justify non-attendance by making sarcastic comments later as an excuse for not attending. I ended up rather disillusioned about "honor systems." Observation: Planning a 7 session program doesn't seem to attract many even if the program is well-planned and well presented.

Clarification and a better description of certain activities would help us in making a more intelligent choice. Ex. C-P-R Seminar -- Did it involve only 1 session, repeated several times, or was it on-going. Ex. Grammar of Design A better description would have helped. Spent years learning how to write behavioral objectives. Didn't think that that was what seminar was about. Would have been more interested in class design (ie) group management techniques and what other people are doing for student involvement during class time.

Many of my colleagues attended the grading and academic standards symposium and stated their alarm at the insensitivity of many staff members (especially in the hard sciences) regarding non-traditional students. I do not believe that this "insensitivity is a malicious attitude; but rather, a real need to relate to and teach youngsters who most resemble ourselves. It also, on another level, may tend to acquaint us with some inadequacies in our teaching methods. I truly regret missing this symposium and I am requesting that this kind of activity be continued.

My evaluation was not based upon interest, I would not have attended were I not interested. It is based upon value of the activity to me based upon what I assumed to be its intent.

Some categories not listed for evaluation. Such as individual projects carried out that related to a specific course being taught. More than one physical fitness seminar attended and participated in!

More than one Phys Fit Section. Nothing on film preview.

The most outstanding 6 sessions I attended are not listed here. The Seminars on Instructional Design.

Poor availability, prior to events, of info about events. Some not listed ie Manahan's Yoga ... etc.

I also attended the seminar on Computer Programming sponsored by the Data Processing department to help me in developing a program in my area. The meetings I attended all had potential, but were not well planned. I gained more from working on my own instructional projects.

I did some "table-hopping," sometimes attending two sessions for part of each when they were scheduled simultaneously. At least one series I attended only partially. These ratings are primarily intended as subjective, i.e., they indicate, as requested, a balance of my estimate of my interest in them (subjective), and their value for me, tempered somewhat by an awareness of their objective, general value. Sometimes I am interested in things of dubious general value. Less often I may recognize some general value in a matter but feel that I can do little for it or it for me personally. Some of the subjects presented, for example, would be of much interest for many teachers, I recognize, but still feel they don't apply very directly to my teacher field and/or my teaching style.

Some scheduled events were changed. The events that were scheduled and conducted had no stated time when it would end.

Attendance was poor overall.

Could have had more publicity so instructors would know what to expect. Did the information justify the means.!?

I don't feel that the numbers assigned necessarily need amplification.

Book fair was interesting, but it should have been exciting as well. How? I don't know. Why didn't the film people take advantage of the time and run an announced schedule of films for review and possible purchase.

I really feel that scheduling hampered my attending some meetings I really wanted to attend. Some were scheduled at the same hour. Some I heard about too late and really had not been interested in until I heard good reports (such as the "Teacher Personality/Style Workshop"). Speaker was really a dreadful bore--but his subj. was of interest. He could have condensed all he had to say of importance to, say, five minutes.

Would have appreciated more English/Reading textbooks. Group more interested in teaching past the age of 65--I was interested in early retirement. No seats available at "Governance" meeting nor could I hear. Thus, I finally left the meeting. Attended Division meeting on English 1A writing--interesting. Attended the Division meetings on Reading classes--very good.

Recommendations

I would like a one week program similar to this past one, then another week much like an educational conference with at least one speaker of national stature.

I feel more time spent on individual projects would be more helpful to me. I also spent 2 days in S.F. at a workshop on Meditation, Consciousness, and biofeedback techniques.

I chose a very small number of seminars--all of which I knew would be very interesting to me personally. The seminars were not selected because I felt that they would serve as a means of improvement of my instructions in the classroom. I feel that I would like to see more time and more effort directed to topics more directly concerned with improvement of instruction--either at the course, division, or college level.

It's hard to think some of these "presentations" would be other than entertaining. I can't see where many would benefit me as a teacher. I would like to see this program eliminated or reduced (to 1 wk.?) so that we don't lose so much class time. I am very rushed, I like to teach and I hate "busy work"! Some department activities were useful.

Better advertisement on the day of the activity. More support by the Deans and other administrators. I think this can be of great benefit if you can get more involved. The attendance was not as good as I would hope it would be. Many people prepared workshops and had little attendance.

As far as I am concerned the extra two weeks with no students is a waste of everyones time and the "in-service" activities are nothing but filler for that time. Some thing some one thought up to waste two weeks. Thats nothing against the people who tried to make something out of nothing. The entire early semester concept is the culprit. It was put in with little or no faculty input, and now we have to be on campus to "clean our files, plan for next semester,"etc. What a waste of everthing! Why not, if we are stuck with this inane early semester system, begin classes the third week in January and get out two weeks earlier in May so that people can begin summer jobs to earn money so they can stay in school to make up for what they are loosing by beginning three weeks earlier in the fall semester. I realize this would make too much sense and that's why we are not doing it.

In the future, I would suggest more department or division seminars for upgrading purposes.

Would like to see 2 panel discussions with any or all questions asked and answered. 1- The Board 2- The President and Vice Presidents.

The time could be used much more effectively if it were returned to normal teaching. If this is not feasible then use it for rewriting course outlines, examining new textbooks, planning new courses or revising old ones, etc.

I believe the two weeks should be returned to the students and their education. This is the best use of taxpayers' money.

The slides (Kyoto and Bali) were of interest to me--as an individual--as I plan to visit these places soon. For the faculty in general, rating would be a "2". The District Bus Tour was excellent--should be required for all staff (classified and certificated) to get a first-hand feeiing for the size, extent and makeup of our District and the diverse areas our students come from. "Ham" Maddaford's commentary was informative and well done--the PE staff should have "shut up" so we could all hear. Suggest that next time it is offered, that the total tour be completed--prior to lunch--not enough time to eat and enjoy the camaraderie of old friends (so seldom seen on our "divisionalized" campus). Overall, --give us--and our students--back the 10 teaching days. Sequential courses are harmed by these "short" semesters.

A Physical Fitness class for faculty and staff should be offered. Tom Storer would be an excellent instructor for the class which would be of great benefit to the over the hill gang. I would participate in such a class given at an appropriate time.

It would have been nice if the entire faculty would have gotten together so as to be better acquainted with our colleagues.

Also (not on this list): 2 off-campus field trips, Open House Plus by Disabled Students, and two in-service meetings w/Frank Christ* of CSULB. If we do this again, I recommend a better calendar with specific days of the week reserved for specific types of activities. Our department should engage an off-campus professional consultant (like Christ*) to help us with our considerable problems. I am in favor of in-service training (and group therapy!)

APPENDIX B

PER CENT OF RESPONSES OF THE FLEXIBLE CALENDAR - FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

BY DIVISION

N=300

In the following areas please respond according to your degree of agreement to each statement.	Division	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. Shortened Instructional Year						
It was necessary to drastically revise the content for my courses due to the change from an 18 week to a 16 week semester.	BS	4	15	4	52	22
	B		13		58	29
	FA		8	21	42	29
	H	4	12	8	40	36
	IT		10	10	63	13
	IR			17	33	
	MC	13	20	7	40	20
	NS	16	31	6	34	9
	PS	9		13	52	22
	PE		12		53	35
	SS	4	8	8	54	21
	C			50	25	
	ND	2	14	6	43	31
I was able to cover the necessary course content adequately in the 16 week semester.	BS	22	41		26	11
	B	29	54		17	
	FA	33	46		17	
	H	32	44	4	4	16
	IT	10	67	3	13	7
	IR		33	17		
	MC	13	47		7	27
	NS	3	44	3	34	13
	PS		61	9	26	4
	PE	35	53		12	
	SS	21	67		8	4
	C		25	50		
	ND	18	55	6	12	4
Due to the 16 week semester student achievement in my course(s) was reduced significantly compared to past student performance.	BS	7	22		52	19
	B		8	13	50	29
	FA		4	13	46	29
	H	4	12	4	40	40
	IT	7	13	7	60	13
	IR			17	17	
	MC	20	20	20	27	7
	NS	9	22	13	41	13
	PS	4	17	26	39	9
	PE			24	41	35
	SS		4	17	50	29
	C			50	25	
	ND	2	4	20	43	27

	Division	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. Shortened Instructional Year (continued)						
The 16 week semester did not detract from the quality of my instruction.	BS	30	44	7	11	7
	B	38	46	8	8	
	FA	42	25	8	13	4
	H	36	36	4	16	8
	IT	13	70		13	3
	IR	17	17	17		
	MC	20	13	7	27	27
	NS	9	47	6	22	13
	PS	13	39	17	26	4
	PE	41	47		12	
	SS	33	42	4	13	4
	C	25	25	25		
	ND	35	43	2	14	
The 16 week semester increased student persistence in my course(s).	BS	7	4	44	33	11
	B	4	17	46	29	
	FA	13	17	38	21	4
	H	8	16	48	16	4
	IT	3	30	43	17	3
	IR			50		
	MC	7	7	33	7	40
	NS		13	44	22	19
	PS			43	22	26
	PE	24	24	35	18	
	SS	4	13	50	33	
	C		25	50		
	ND	14	22	37	10	8
B. Early Semester Calendar						
Eliminating the need to continue the Fall semester after the Christmas vacation is a positive feature of the early semester calendar.	BS	52	22		4	22
	B	79	17		4	
	FA	54	25	8		13
	H	76	8	4	8	4
	IT	63	33			3
	IR	50	17			17
	MC	40	33	7		20
	NS	59	31			9
	PS	70	17	4	4	4
	PE	76				24
	SS	50	38	4	8	
	C	50	50			
	ND	61	20		6	6

B. Early Semester Calendar (continued)

	Division	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The early semester calendar interfered with my summer vacation.	BS	26	15	22	7	30
	B	21	4	17	42	17
	FA	21	25	13	33	8
	H	16	16	8	40	20
	IT	23	30	10	23	13
	IR	33	17		17	17
	MC	27	20	20	20	13
	NS	19	16	16	38	9
	PS	30	13	13	17	26
	PE	41	6	6	24	24
	SS	13	38	17	17	13
	C	25	25		50	
	ND	20	16	10	31	18
The early start calendar caused students to register late for the Fall term and they were unable to "catch up" with course material.	BS	7	22	19	33	19
	B	4	4	21	46	25
	FA	13	17	25	42	4
	H		8	16	52	20
	IT	3	3	37	50	7
	IR			33	17	
	MC	13	20	33	20	13
	NS	9	9	19	50	13
	PS		9	26	39	26
	PE	18		18	41	24
	SS		13	25	50	13
	C		25	25	50	
	ND	6	6	29	37	16
I would like to see our college return to the traditional semester calendar.	BS	26	11	7	11	44
	B	8		4	33	54
	FA	25	8	21	4	38
	H	8	8	4	28	52
	IT	17	7	17	23	37
	IR	33		17	17	17
	MC	33	7	7	20	33
	NS	22	3	9	38	28
	PS	13	4	4	35	43
	PE	29		6	29	29
	SS	8	4	17	50	21
	C		25		50	
	ND	16	4	8	27	39

C. Non-Instructional Days

The use of 10 "Non-instructional days" in the current college calendar:

	Division	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(a) Provided time for staff development opportunities not available to faculty in prior years	BS	26	33	7	22	11
	B	21	42	29	8	
	FA	25	29	29	4	8
	H	24	44	12	8	12
	IT	27	37	30		7
	IR		67	33		
	MC	20	27	20	7	27
	NS	22	38	9	3	25
	PS	13	57	13	9	9
	PE	47	29	6	6	12
	SS	17	54	17	8	4
	C	25	50	25		
	ND	27	27	20	16	2
(b) Improved college communication						
(1) among faculty within my Division	BS	11	37	7	33	11
	B	17	29	29	17	
	FA	17	42	29	4	8
	H		48	20	16	16
	IT	17	30	33	10	10
	IR		50	33		
	MC	20	13	13	20	27
	NS	3	22	22	22	25
	PS	17	39	22	9	13
	PE	24	29	6	18	24
	SS	8	42	25	17	8
	C			25	50	
	ND	20	33	18	16	2
(2) between faculty and administration	BS	11	22	11	37	19
	B		21	50	29	
	FA	4	13	58	13	13
	H		40	20	20	12
	IT	10	17	50	10	10
	IR			83		
	MC	13		20	20	40
	NS		13	22	31	25
	PS		9	39	35	17
	PE	12	18	29	12	24
	SS		21	33	38	8
	C			25	50	
	ND	10	18	37	16	6

C. Non-Instructional Days (continued)

(b) Improved college communication (continued)

	Division	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(3) among faculty in different Division	BS	19	37	7	30	7
	B	4	21	50	25	
	FA	8	29	46	8	8
	H	4	32	20	24	12
	IT	7	17	47	20	7
	IR		67	17		
	MC	7	13	33	7	27
	NS			41	28	25
	PS		26	39	17	17
	PE	18	47	18		18
	SS	4	33	21	29	8
	C		25		50	
	ND	8	29	33	12	6
(4) between full-time and part-time faculty	BS	7	30	15	30	19
	B	21	54	21		4
	FA	4	13	42	17	25
	H			40	40	12
	IT	7	17	40	20	10
	IR		17	67		
	MC		13	7	33	40
	NS	3	9	22	34	25
	PS	4	4	26	30	35
	PE	6	41	12	12	24
	SS		4	33	46	13
	C			25	50	
	ND	14	16	31	14	10
(5) between faculty and support staff	BS	7	22	22	30	19
	B	4	13	50	29	4
	FA	8	4	46	21	13
	H		32	28	24	12
	IT	3	20	40	20	10
	IR		33	50		
	MC		13	33	7	40
	NS		19	31	22	22
	PS		26	26	26	22
	PE	12	24	24	12	24
	SS		29	25	29	13
	C			25	50	
	ND	8	24	37	14	2

C. Non-Instructional Days (continued)

	Division	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(c) Provided collegewide activities of benefit to me	BS	19	44	4	11	19
	B	8	46	29	17	
	FA	8	42	25	13	4
	H	8	44	8	20	12
	IT	3	37	30	20	7
	IR	17	67	17		
	MC	20	27	7	20	27
	NS		28	22	9	34
	PS		30	30	30	9
	PE	18	47	6	12	18
	SS		58	13	17	8
	C				50	50
	ND	18	31	18	12	8
(d) Provided Division-wide activities of benefit to me	BS	15	30	11	30	11
	B	13	42	33	13	
	FA	13	38	29	4	8
	H	8	40	12	20	12
	IT	13	30	30	20	7
	IR		67	17		
	MC	20	27	7	20	20
	NS	6	13	28	22	28
	PS	4	43	17	26	9
	PE	24	41	12	6	18
	SS	4	46	21	21	8
	C				50	50
	ND	20	31	14	12	10
(e) Provided individual project activities of benefit to me.	BS	33	19	19	19	11
	B	25	33	29	13	
	FA	33	33	21		8
	H	44	20	8	8	12
	IT	20	43	23	3	7
	IR		50	33		17
	MC	20	20	13	13	27
	NS	25	25	16	13	19
	PS	30	39	22	4	4
	PE	35	35	12		12
	SS	29	42	17	4	4
	C				50	50
	ND	27	27	16	10	8

C. Non-Instructional Days (continued)

	Division	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
There was adequate faculty planning in the development of						
(a) the college academic calendar	BS	7	30	37	15	7
	B	13	33	42	8	4
	FA		29	54	13	
	H	4	52	32	4	4
	IT	7	47	40	7	
	IR		33	50		
	MC	13	20	33	13	13
	NS	6	38	16	13	25
	PS		17	43	30	9
	PE	12	24	29	12	24
	SS	4	29	33	25	8
	C			50	50	
	ND	12	24	27	20	4
(b) activities during the non-instructional days.	BS	7	41	26	22	4
	B	8	46	42		
	FA		33	38	17	4
	H	8	28	32	12	12
	IT	7	57	30	3	
	IR		50	33		17
	MC	27	27	27		13
	NS	6	38	25	13	16
	PS	4	43	30	13	4
	PE	18	59	12		12
	SS	8	46	25	21	
	C		25	25		50
	ND	12	35	18	16	4
There was sufficient information supplied to faculty concerning activities possible during the non-instructional days.	BS	19	41	7	26	7
	B	8	54	21	13	4
	FA	4	42	25	13	13
	H	8	44	16	28	
	IT	10	57	23	3	3
	IR		50	17	17	17
	MC	20	40		27	13
	NS	6	44	19	6	22
	PS	9	61	17	9	4
	PE	6	59	6	24	
	SS	8	42	25	13	13
	C			25	25	50
	ND	10	29	16	31	

The 10 non-instructional days were most beneficial for me in the areas of: (check no more than three)

(a) major redesign of course(s)	BS	30
	B	4
	FA	17
	H	16
	IT	20
	IR	
	MC	20
	NS	31
	PS	
	PE	18
	SS	4
	C	
	ND	27
(b) new course/program development	BS	26
	B	25
	FA	17
	H	20
	IT	23
	IR	
	MC	20
	NS	28
	PS	9
	PE	18
	SS	8
	C	
	ND	12
(c) updating of course content	BS	44
	B	33
	FA	38
	H	44
	IT	37
	IR	33
	MC	27
	NS	41
	PS	39
	PE	53
	SS	50
	C	
	ND	47

The 10 non-instructional days were most beneficial for me in the areas of: (check no more than three) (continued)

(d) developing new instructional materials for use in classroom	BS	30
	B	38
	FA	42
	H	44
	IT	33
	IR	33
	MC	33
	NS	31
	PS	65
	PE	29
	SS	33
	C	
	ND	27
(e) developing new instructional materials for use in Learning Resource Center	BS	
	B	
	FA	4
	H	
	IT	
	IR	17
	MC	
	NS	
	PS	4
	PE	
	SS	
	C	
	ND	2
(f) developing new instructional materials for use in course/program evaluation	BS	
	B	
	FA	4
	H	
	IT	10
	IR	
	MC	7
	NS	9
	PS	9
	PE	12
	SS	4
	C	
	ND	

The 10 non-instructional days were most beneficial to me in the areas of: (check no more than three) (continued)

(g)	exploring alternative instructional methods	BS 15 B 25 FA 17 H 36 IT 3 IR MC 7 NS 16 PS 4 PE 18 SS 17 C ND 20
(h)	field visits to other college programs	BS 4 B 21 FA 8 H 4 IT 17 IR 33 MC 20 NS 6 PS 17 PE 12 SS 17 C ND 12
(i)	field visits to sites related to my program area	BS 11 B 21 FA 13 H IT 23 IR 50 MC 7 NS 13 PS 26 PE 6 SS 17 C ND 16

The 10 non-instructional days were most beneficial to me in the areas of: (check no more than three) (continued)

(j) college meetings, conferences	BS	22
	B	8
	FA	4
	H	16
	IT	
	IR	33
	MC	13
	NS	9
	PS	13
	PE	12
	SS	29
	C	25
	ND	14
(k) division meetings or conferences	BS	7
	B	8
	FA	13
	H	16
	IT	20
	IR	
	MC	7
	NS	
	PS	30
	PE	12
	SS	25
	C	
	ND	18
(l) inservice training workshops at the college	BS	26
	B	8
	FA	13
	H	8
	IT	7
	IR	17
	MC	7
	NS	6
	PS	
	PE	41
	SS	17
	C	25
	ND	16

The 10 non-instructional days were most beneficial to me in the areas of: (check no more than three) (continued)

(m) professional conferences on workshops

BS	
B	13
FA	4
H	8
IT	10
IR	
MC	
NS	
PS	
PE	18
SS	4
C	
ND	2

(n) student advising

BS	7
B	4
FA	4
H	
IT	
IR	
MC	
NS	
PS	
PE	18
SS	
C	25
ND	2

(o) subject area research

BS	19
B	4
FA	42
H	20
IT	17
IR	17
MC	13
NS	13
PS	22
PE	24
SS	25
C	
ND	10

The 10 non-instructional days were most beneficial to me in the areas of: (check no more than three) (continued)

(p) institutional research	BS	
	B	
	FA	
	H	
	IT	
	IR	
	MC	7
	NS	
	PS	4
	PE	
	SS	
	C	
	ND	
(q) review of library holdings	BS	4
	B	
	FA	13
	H	8
	IT	
	IR	
	MC	
	NS	
	PS	4
	PE	
	SS	21
	C	
	ND	8
(r) assessment of community needs and preferences	BS	11
	B	4
	FA	4
	H	
	IT	
	IR	
	MC	
	NS	
	PS	
	PE	
	SS	
	C	
	ND	2

The 10 non-instructional days were most beneficial to me in the areas of: (check no more than three) (continued)

(s) develop short-term courses	BS	
	B	
	FA	4
	H	
	IT	
	Ir	
	MC	
	NS	
	PS	
	PE	6
	SS	4
	C	
	ND	
(t) relief for classroom.	BS	7
	B	4
	FA	8
	H	
	IT	3
	IR	
	MC	7
	NS	3
	PS	
	PE	6
	SS	8
	C	
	ND	2

The 10 days devoted to non-instructional activities during the current academic year are: (check one)

(a) not enough	BS	
	B	
	FA	8
	H	
	IT	
	IR	
	MC	
	NS	
	PS	
	PE	
	SS	8
	C	
	ND	

The 10 days devoted to non-instructional activities during the current academic year are: (check one) (continued)

(b) too much	BS	44
	B	29
	FA	38
	H	20
	IT	17
	IR	50
	MC	40
	NS	34
	PS	43
	PE	35
	SS	25
	C	
	ND	27
(c) just about right.	BS	44
	B	46
	FA	42
	H	60
	IT	57
	IR	50
	MC	27
	NS	44
	PS	43
	PE	53
	SS	54
	C	25
	ND	45

The most productive time for scheduling the non-instructional days is: (check one)

(a) immediately prior to the Fall presemester	BS	7
	B	21
	FA	8
	H	28
	IT	7
	IR	17
	MC	
	NS	3
	PS	13
	PE	12
	SS	4
	C	25
	ND	12

The most productive time for scheduling the non-instructional days is: (check one) (continued)

(b) in January, between the two semesters	BS	59
	B	46
	FA	54
	H	44
	IT	63
	IR	83
	MC	47
	NS	59
	PS	52
	PE	53
	SS	71
	C	75
	ND	55
(c) at the end of the academic year	BS	
	B	4
	FA	8
	H	
	IT	3
	IR	
	MC	
	NS	
	PS	9
	PE	
	SS	4
	C	
	ND	
(d) during the Fall or Spring semester	BS	19
	B	
	FA	8
	H	
	IT	3
	IR	
	MC	7
	NS	3
	PS	4
	PE	18
	SS	4
	C	
	ND	8

The most productive time for scheduling the non-instructional days is: (check one) (continued)

(e) during Summer.	BS	
	B	
	FA	
	H	
	IT	
	IR	
	MC	
	NS	
	PS	
	PE	6
	SS	8
	C	
	ND	

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 9 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

Legend:
- BS Behavioral Sciences & Foreign Languages
- B Business Education
- FA Fine Arts
- H Humanities
- IT Industry & Technology
- IR Instructional Resources
- MC Mathematics & Computer Sciences
- NS Natural Sciences
- PS Physical Sciences
- PE Physical Education & Athletics
- SS Social Sciences

- C Counseling
- ND No Designation